2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SHIKEB SADDOZAI,

Plaintiff,

v.

RON DAVIS, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 18-05558 BLF (PR)

ORDER OF PARTIAL DISMISSAL AND SERVICE; DIRECTING DEFENDANT TO FILE DISPOSITIVE MOTION OR NOTICE REGARDING SUCH MOTION; INSTRUCTIONS TO CLERK

Plaintiff, a California inmate, filed the instant *pro se* civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against employees at San Quentin State Prison ("SQSP"). The Court twice dismissed the complaint with leave to amend for Plaintiff to comply with Rules 18(a) and 20(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. (Docket Nos. 7, 15.) Plaintiff has filed a second amended complaint. (Docket No. 19, hereinafter "SAC.")

DISCUSSION

A. Standard of Review

A federal court must conduct a preliminary screening in any case in which a prisoner seeks redress from a governmental entity or officer or employee of a governmental entity. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915A(a). In its review, the court must identify any

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

cognizable claims and dismiss any claims that are frivolous, malicious, fail to state a claim upon which relief may be granted or seek monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief. *See id.* § 1915A(b)(1),(2). Pro se pleadings must, however, be liberally construed. *See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't*, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1988).

To state a claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and (2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *See West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

B. Plaintiff's Claims

Plaintiff claims that on August 14, 2018, he was beaten and battered by four inmates. (SAC at 4.) Plaintiff claims that Defendant Clawson "acted with deliberate indifference, discharged and fired his weapon shooting [Plaintiff] on his lower back towards his buttocks, rather than the four intended targets, without verbal warning." (Id.) Plaintiff claims that Defendant Clawson had pepper spray which was less likely to cause serious bodily injury, but failed to use this alternative, "intentionally to cause [Plaintiff] injury, which served no penological interest due to [Plaintiff] being the victim, and failed to protect from harm." (Id.) Based on his actions, Plaintiff claims Defendant Clawson violated his rights under the Fourth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendments. (Id.) Plaintiff seeks declaratory and injunctive relief as well as damages. (Id. at 6.) Liberally construed, Plaintiff's allegations are sufficient to state a cognizable claim against Defendant Clawson under the Eighth Amendment for failure to protect. See Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 832 (1994); Hearns v. Terhune, 413 F.3d 1036, 1041-42 (9th Cir. 2005). However, the Court finds Plaintiff fails to state any claim under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments because there are no allegations indicating that Defendant Clawson violated Plaintiff's right to due process. Plaintiff has already been afforded two opportunities to amend, and this Court has broad discretion to deny leave to amend where Plaintiff has already been granted leave to file an amended complaint. See Wagh v. Metris Direct, Inc., 363 F.3d

8

9

10

1

2

1112

13 14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

24

23

2526

27

28

821, 830 (9th Cir. 2003); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1261 (9th Cir. 1992). Accordingly, Plaintiff shall not be afforded any further opportunity to correct this deficiency.

Plaintiff also claims that "unknown supervisory officials" authorized his transfer to disciplinary housing unit "without a hearing, and with loss of privileges, devoid of disciplinary violation, when it was reflected that [Plaintiff] was the victim of assault," which does appear to state a due process violation. (SAC at 5.) Furthermore, Plaintiff claims that he was repeatedly denied complaint and medical forms upon his request to prevent him from exercising his First Amendment rights to initial a civil action, and to receive medical treatment while housed in disciplinary; he does not identify any responsible individual for these violations. (Id.) Plaintiff's original and first amended complaints were dismissed for failure to comply with Rules 18(a) and 20(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure which requires proper joinder of claims and defendants. Fed. R. Civ. P. 18(a), 20(a); see George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007). The claims against "unknown supervisory officials" for Plaintiff's placement in disciplinary housing without due process and against unknown parties for the violations of his First Amendment rights and access to medical treatment are not related to his Eighth Amendment claim against Defendant Clawson for failure to protect. Accordingly, the Court will dismiss these claims for failure to comply with Rules 18(a) and 20(a).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons state above, the Court orders as follows:

1. Plaintiff's claims under the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments against Defendant Clawson are **DISMISSED** for failure to state a claim. The claims against "unknown supervisory officials" for due process violations, as well as First Amendment and denial of medical treatment claims are dismissed for failure to comply with Rules 18(a) and 20(a). The only claim that will proceed in this action is against Defendant

1

4 5

7

8

6

9

1112

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

27

28

Clawson for failure to protect under the Eighth Amendment.

- 2. The Clerk of the Court shall mail a Notice of Lawsuit and Request for Waiver of Service of Summons, two copies of the Waiver of Service of Summons, a copy of the second amended complaint, (Docket No. 19), all attachments thereto, and a copy of this order upon **Defendant Correctional Officer Clawson** at the **San Quentin State Prison (San Quentin, CA 94974).** The Clerk shall also mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff.
- 3. Defendants are cautioned that Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires them to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and the complaint. Pursuant to Rule 4, if Defendants, after being notified of this action and asked by the Court, on behalf of Plaintiff, to waive service of the summons, fail to do so, they will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause shown for their failure to sign and return the waiver form. If service is waived, this action will proceed as if Defendants had been served on the date that the waiver is filed, except that pursuant to Rule 12(a)(1)(B), Defendants will not be required to serve and file an answer before sixty (60) days from the day on which the request for waiver was sent. (This allows a longer time to respond than would be required if formal service of summons is necessary.) Defendants are asked to read the statement set forth at the foot of the waiver form that more completely describes the duties of the parties with regard to waiver of service of the summons. If service is waived after the date provided in the Notice but before Defendants have been personally served, the Answer shall be due sixty (60) days from the date on which the request for waiver was sent or twenty (20) days from the date the waiver form is filed, whichever is later.
- 4. No later than **ninety-one** (**91**) **days** from the date this order is filed,
 Defendants shall file a motion for summary judgment or other dispositive motion with
 respect to the claims in the complaint found to be cognizable above.
 - a. Any motion for summary judgment shall be supported by adequate

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

factual documentation and shall conform in all respects to Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendants are advised that summary judgment cannot be granted, nor qualified immunity found, if material facts are in dispute. If any Defendant is of the opinion that this case cannot be resolved by summary judgment, he shall so inform the Court prior to the date the summary judgment motion is due.

- b. In the event Defendants file a motion for summary judgment, the Ninth Circuit has held that Plaintiff must be concurrently provided the appropriate warnings under Rand v. Rowland, 154 F.3d 952, 963 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc). See Woods v. Carey, 684 F.3d 934, 940 (9th Cir. 2012).
- 5. Plaintiff's opposition to the dispositive motion shall be filed with the Court and served on Defendants no later than twenty-eight (28) days from the date Defendants' motion is filed.

Plaintiff is also advised to read Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317 (1986) (holding party opposing summary judgment must come forward with evidence showing triable issues of material fact on every essential element of his claim). Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to file an opposition to Defendants' motion for summary judgment may be deemed to be a consent by Plaintiff to the granting of the motion, and granting of judgment against Plaintiff without a trial. See Ghazali v. Moran, 46 F.3d 52, 53-54 (9th Cir. 1995) (per curiam); Brydges v. Lewis, 18 F.3d 651, 653 (9th Cir. 1994).

- 6. Defendants shall file a reply brief no later than **fourteen (14) days** after Plaintiff's opposition is filed.
- 7. The motion shall be deemed submitted as of the date the reply brief is due. No hearing will be held on the motion unless the Court so orders at a later date.
- 8. All communications by the Plaintiff with the Court must be served on Defendants, or Defendants' counsel once counsel has been designated, by mailing a true copy of the document to Defendants or Defendants' counsel.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

25

26

27

28

1

2

9. Discovery may be	taken in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil
Procedure. No further court order	er under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(a)(2) or Local
Rule 16-1 is required before the	parties may conduct discovery.

- 10. It is Plaintiff's responsibility to prosecute this case. Plaintiff must keep the court informed of any change of address and must comply with the court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).
- 11. Extensions of time must be filed no later than the deadline sought to be extended and must be accompanied by a showing of good cause.

IT IS SO ORDERED

Dated: _December 10, 2019_

BETH LABSON FREEMAN United States District Judge

Order of Partial Dismissal and Svc PRO-SE\BLF\CR.18\05558Saddozai_svc